

Application No.: 09/933,781

Docket No.: 26391-702

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 7 and 12 are cancelled. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 2, 4, 8 and 18.

Claims Amendments

Claim 2, previously dependent from deleted claim 1, has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 2 has been further amended to recite that the 'service sessions' coupled to the controller have 'data traffic'. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0019] and [0123], of the present specification. Claim 2 has been further amended to replace an instance of the term 'mobile device' with the more clear term 'mobile user device' as introduced earlier in the claim. Claim 3, previously dependent from deleted claim 1, has been amended to depend from claim 2. Claims 13 – 17, previously dependent from deleted claim 12, have been rewritten in independent form. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Rejection(s) under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctively claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, in particular the term "the data traffic" in claim 1, line 9 lacking antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been cancelled, claim 2 had been rewritten independent form and claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 2. Claim 2 has been further amended to recite that the 'service sessions' coupled to the controller have 'data traffic' thereby

Application No.: 09/933,781

Docket No.: 26391-702

providing antecedent basis for the later reference in claim 2 to 'data traffic'. As claim 3 now depends from claim 2, proper antecedent basis is also provided for claim 3.

Rejection(s) under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Do et al. (US Patent 6,731,945). Claim 1 has been cancelled by this reply. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 2 which has been made independent by this reply. The rejection is respectfully traversed as it pertains to claim 3. Claim 2 is not anticipated by Do et al. Therefore, claim 3 which now depends from claim 2 is not anticipated by Do et al.

Rejection(s) under 35 USC § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Do et al. (US Patent 6,731,945). Claim 7 has been cancelled by this reply. Thus, the rejection is now moot.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chara (US Patent 6,781,960) in view of Holmes et al. (US Patent 6,134,432). Claim 12 has been cancelled by this reply. Thus, the rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

The above remarks and amendments are believed to require no further prior art search. Applicants believe that this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in a condition for allowance. If this proves to be incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Application No.: 09/933,781

Docket No.: 26391-702

Dated: October 4, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Robert A. Vincent
Registration No.: 55,970

Vincent Patent Agency
P.O. Box 85007
1250 Main Street
Ottawa (Stittsville), ON
CANADA K2S 1X6
Tel: 613-482-2958
Fax: 613-822-4802
Agent for Applicant